



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
WASHINGTON, DC 20350-2000

11A 2-89
NS # 5382X-89

IN REPLY REFER TO
3800
Ser 092/9U527971
10 February 1989

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR RESOURCES AND EVALUATION (DDR&E),
INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY STAFF

Subject: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED DCI TOP-LEVEL REQUIREMENTS STRUCTURE

LOGGED

IC STAFF ☐

1. Based on our participation in previous Ad Hoc Steering Group iterations on this subject, no changes are recommended to the documentation provided. However, the following comments are provided for your consideration:


- A. The proposed mechanisms/documents changes and the higher level (SIG-I) working oversight of the requirements process should go a significant distance toward ensuring that Intelligence Community requirements respond directly to top-level national policy directives. These changes will also provide a paper trail so that the ties can be fully documented.
- B. While the changes proposed will help establish a firmer policy foundation for "DCI Guidance to NFIP Program Managers," they will not in any way assist in the final step of the process, which is translating guidance into concrete NFIP programs. There is no current method for ensuring or closely evaluating this step, and the proposed mechanisms do not provide one.
- C. Closing selected gaps by using additional ad hoc cross-program evaluations (a la the SSCI or 1% drills) may or may not result in an enhanced NFIP investment strategy. Traditionally in those drills, a pot of resources is defined at the onset, and programs are resurrected or developed to fit the size and color of the pot. While all programs presented are generally applicable, there is a wide variance from program to program in their final ability to actually move us closer to a solution to the problem in question. In the SSCI case, several whole classes of potential solutions were actually excluded from the final approval set because they were non-overhead. In the future, "cross-program review" must mean exactly that. Also, dwindling resources demand that a more honest appraisal of the effectiveness of each proposed solution must be attempted, with only the most effective surviving the cut.
- D. Changes resulting from this proposal to the current NFIB/NFIC inventory of responsibilities are a cause of concern. Service voice in the development of the NFIP, and therefore the responsiveness of the Intelligence Community to the needs of the tactical community is being muted, not ignored--muted, by these changes. CJCS and his staff now have little visibility or expertise to offer in the

STAT

Subject: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED DCI TOP-LEVEL REQUIREMENTS STRUCTURE

development of the NFIP. National policy support tends to be served better by a strengthening of the ability to support the tactical community vice a weakening of that ability.

2. One recommendation to alleviate some of the concern expressed above would be to exert a concerted effort to identify clear and concise procedural mechanisms that would effectively translate Guidance into Programs on a broad scale while retaining sufficient Community dialogue and input to the process.



RICHARD L. HAVER
Deputy Director of
Naval Intelligence